History of the University of Minnesota /

J. B. Gilfillan.

HISTORY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA.*

* Read at the monthly meeting of the Executive Council, December 11, 1905. This Address has been published also by the University in a pamphlet (46 pages, 1906), with the following dedication: “To its two presidents, Dr. William W. Folwell and Dr. Cyrus Northrop, whose life work has made the University what it is, this paper is respectfully dedicated by the Author.”

BY HON. JOHN B. GILFILLAN.

SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES IN THE AMERICAN COLONIES.

Seeing may be knowing, but only the superficial mind can accept the “dead result” of our laws or institutions as knowledge of them. The leaven of “know thyself” must ever work through the individual to the conditions which are his opportunity of vivid, progressing life. So more and more we seek to understand the historical origin of institutions peculiar to us as a nation, whether they have sprung from necessity, the great mother of invention, or whether we brought the nucleus across the Atlantic, whether they are American or Americanized. Nothing, of our many valued possessions, has been more generally conceded our own, than our system of education. For the sake of a clear understanding of its growth and the laws protecting it, and that our appreciation of results may be the outcome of basic, historical information, not superficial observation, we will venture to trace the derivative and American elements in a system which by its form of support has become, before the world, our own.

While Frederick II. was warring for Jaffa and Jerusalem, and Edward I. was fighting for the Stone of Scone, the Dutch were establishing at Dordrecht, ten miles from Rotterdam, a Latin School, which was the beginning of State School systems (founded in 1290). This school became one of the most famous in northwestern Europe, having frequently six hundred pupils, coming from all parts of the continent. Of the first colonists landing in Massachusetts, one-thirtieth were graduates of Cambridge. Of this number those who had been voluntary exiles in Holland must have 44 known the Dordrecht School and the laws controlling it. England had no provision for general education, for two hundred years after it was thoroughly established in Holland.

Martin Luther in 1524 wrote in a letter to magistrates:

If there were no soul, no heaven, no future after this life, and temporal affairs were to be administered solely with a view to the present, it would yet be sufficient reason for establishing in every place the best schools, both for boys and girls, that the world merely to maintain its outward prosperity has need of shrewd and accomplished men and women.

At this time, on this basis, the parochial schools of Germany were established. About the same time, John Calvin at Geneva gave a similar system to the Cantons of Switzerland. John Knox, learning from these men, introduced a system of schools in Scotland. This was in the last half of the sixteenth century, fully a hundred years before definite free schools had been established in the American Colonies, Virginia, New York and Massachusetts each claiming a priority in this.

In 1619, three years after the death of William Shakespeare, Sir Edwin Sandys, President of the Virginia Company in England, moved in Parliament the grant of 15,000 acres of land for the establishment of a University in Virginia, 10,000 of this to be set aside for an Indian College, the remainder “for the foundation of a seminary of learning for the English.” The same year the Bishops of England raised £1,500 for the education of the children of the barbarians in the colony of Virginia. Tenants were sent to occupy the lands, and Mr.

George Thorpe, of His Majesty's Private Chamber, came over to be superintendent of the University. This was in 1621, and in 1622 came the Indian massacres. From that time, though efforts were constantly made, moneys raised, and lands granted, nothing was done for sixty years, except on paper, towards the public establishment of schools in Virginia. In 1688 £2,500 ($12,500) were subscribed, by wealthy gentlemen in the colony and their English friends, towards an institution of higher education. Rev. James Blair was sent to England in its interests, and appealed directly to Queen Mary. King William was interested, through her, in the aspiration of the Colony, and they allowed “£2,000 out of the quitrents of Virginia,” for building the college, 45 which was to be called the College of William and Mary. The English government decided to give 20,000 acres of land and £2,000 in money, with a tax of one penny on every pound of tobacco exported from Maryland and Virginia. To this they added all fees and profits arising from the office of Surveyor General, these fees to be controlled by the president and faculty of the college, which gentlemen were to appoint “special surveyors for the counties whenever the Governor and his council thought it necessary.” These conditions dating from 1693 had a vivid influence on the development of the colony, placing the entire land system in the hands of a collegiate land office. After the Revolution and until 1819, one-sixth “of the fees of all public surveyors continued” to be paid into the college treasury.

Virginia had revenues established and lands granted for a State University in 1621, but in the years required for this Colony to rebound from the Indian massacres of 1622, the freemen of Massachusetts established a system of education, which has been unbroken in its course. In 1635 the people of Boston, in town meeting assembled, made provision for the employment of schoolmasters for the teaching and nurturing of children, and voted lands for their support. This was only five years after the founding of the town. In the same year the Public Latin School was established, and for it has been claimed the distinction of being the oldest existing school within the bounds of the United States. Other Massachusetts towns soon manifested a like liberal spirit for culture, Weymouth in 1643, Ipswich and Salem in 1641. By the Massachusetts Statute of 1642 the duty of establishing

and maintaining schools was made general and obligatory. Five years later this law was amended, enlarged in its scope to make it more effective, and at this time, 1647, it is claimed the school system of Massachusetts had its birth.

While the initial spirit was that of the Massachusetts Bay Colony, other New England neighborhoods, adopting the essence of the Massachusetts law, soon followed in her footsteps. When people from the Boston community emigrated to Hartford, Windsor and Weathersfield, founding the Connecticut Colony, they were a unit in their determined interest for general education. New Hampshire inherited these institutions by virtue of being under 46 Massachusetts law until 1680, and the spirit which made public education a part of her governmental administration spread into the Colonies of New Haven, Plymouth, and Rhode Island. It was during this time that Ezekiel Cheever, through seventy years of teaching, stamped his spirit and method upon the schools of New Haven, Ipswich, Charlestown, and Boston.

In 1621 the Dutch West India Company was organized, and nine years later received instructions from the States General in the founding of colonies, which of course included New Amsterdam, to exert themselves, “to find speedy means to maintain a clergyman and a schoolmaster, in order that divine service and zeal for religion may be planted in that country.” And to that end it was required that “each householder and inhabitant should bear such tax and public charge as should be considered proper for their maintenance.”

Under these provisions the educational policy of New Amsterdam was begun and continued unbroken. As early as 1633 the school of the Protestant Reformed Dutch Church was organized, and has had since then a continuous history. This would seem to give some color to “Brooklyn's claim to have had the first free public school in the United States.”

This triangular discussion regarding the homing of our American school system seems then to resolve itself into Virginia being its mother in 1621, but her effort made abortive

by the Indian massacres of 1622, New Amsterdam twelve years later having the second claim, through her parochial school, while Massachusetts, though founding no free school until 1635, began then and has continuously conducted educational institutions supported by the State. Virginia, New York, and New England, thus became each in their characteristic way the nucleus of a continent's civilization.

The early action with reference to these schools depended largely upon the character of the majority of the settlers, their previous education (religious or otherwise), the purpose of their coming, and the controlling spirit of their leaders. It would seem safe to say that a large percentage of them were inspired by religious zeal and the hope of finding here the enjoyment of religious freedom. This was undoubtedly true in New England, and in certain portions of Virginia extension of the service of the Church of England was 47 a controlling motive. In either event the main purpose of the colonial schools was to fit young men for the ministry. It was in this spirit that the Boston Latin School and the Dutch Reformed School in New Amsterdam were established. Cotton and Eliot, Davenport and Eaton, were among the aggressive pioneers in this work. “Lord, for schools everywhere among us,” was the universal prayer. The year after the Boston Latin School began, Harvard College was projected and founded. “The General Court voted £400 toward a school or college, and the next year twelve of the most trusted men of the colony were selected to execute the official mandate” for a college at New Town.

Inspired by the prevailing enthusiasm, John Harvard, styled a “godly gentleman then living in the Colony,” gave half of his estate of about £1,700 toward the erection of a college, and all his library was added to the gift. Others gave according to their ability and the state added the rest. Such was the early and small beginning of Harvard College, but it marked the spirit of the colonists.

The enthusiasm of its founders and the influence of its instruction were felt in the settlements clustered near the coast, and schools were established at Charlestown, Salem, Dorchester, Roxbury, Braintree, and so on as the settlements extended. The

colleges and primary schools were supplemented by academies, until in 1770 thirty-four had already been established in New England.

In New York, at the time of the surrender of the Dutch in 1664, so general was the educational spirit, that almost every town in the Colony had its regular school; but after the occupation by the English little attention was given to education. The new government had no sympathy with schools under the control of a nonconforming church. It was not until 1732 that a school after the plan of the Boston Latin School was established, which became, as is claimed, the germ of King's College, now Columbia University.

During the colonial period the whole condition in New York was in sharp contrast to that of New England. In 1762 Rev. Dr. Samuel Johnson, President of King's College, writing to the English Archbishop, complained that while royal patents were granted for large tracts of colonial lands, no provision was made for religion and schools. It is also curious to note, that Lieut. Governor 48 Colden, petitioning for aid for King's College, refers to the fact, “that dissenters from the Church of England had the sole education, not only in seminaries of learning in New England, but likewise in New Jersey and elsewhere;” and he argues it to be “highly requisite that a seminary founded on the principles of the Church of England be distinguished in America by particular privileges, not only on account of religion, but of good policy, to prevent the growth of republican principles which already too much prevail in the colonies.” This would seem to give some color of truth to the charge, “that the founding of Harvard College hastened the Revolution half a century.”

In New Jersey the first educational impulses came from several distinct sources. The first was the Dutch overflow from Manhattan Island, which settled near the Hudson; second, the immigration which came from New England and settled Passaic and westward; third, the English and Scotch, who spread over the central portions of the state; fourth, the Friends, who, following the fortunes of Penn, settled the southern and western portions. These each brought with them the customs and institutions of their earlier homes. Prominent among them were the Scotch, who inherited their love of learning from the

days of the Reformation. They brought with them their Book of Discipline, which provided, among other things, “that it was imperatively necessary that there should be a school in every parish, for the instruction of youth in the principles of religion, grammar and the Latin tongue,” and it was further proposed that a college “should be erected in every notable town, in which logic and rhetoric should be taught, along with the learned languages.”

Richard S. Field, in an address printed in the collections of the New Jersey Historical Society, says: “There is no portion of our ancestors of whom we may feel more justly proud than of those who came hither from Scotland.” Graham, himself a Scotchman and the author of by far the best colonial history of the United States, observes that “a great many inhabitants of Scotland emigrated to East Jersey and enriched American society with a valuable accession of virtue refined by adversity, and of piety invigorated by patriotism. Many of them were men of property, of family, and of education. * * * * The same convictions about education 49 were brought by the immigrants into the New World. Education was scarcely loss essential to these hardy immigrants than religion.” It was in such an atmosphere as this that Princeton College had its early beginnings and subsequent growth.

The settlements of the Friends in West Jersey and in Pennsylvania were not indifferent to education, but their schools were schools of the Society, some of them of a high order, as for instance the Penn Charter School of Philadelphia, established in 1698. Half a century later, urged by the interests of the large German population, Dr. Franklin and others were instrumental in organizing the “German Society” in Philadelphia, whose purpose was “to found and maintain schools for the numerous children of German settlers.”

Although the original Penn Charter required the Governor and Provincial Council to erect and order all public schools, and “reward the authors of the useful sciences and laudable inventions in said province,” and although the Pennsylvania Constitution of 1776 declared that “a school or schools shall be established in each county by the legislature, for the convenient instruction of youth, with such salaries to the masters paid by the public as

may enable them to instruct youth at low prices, and all useful learning shall be duly encouraged and promoted in one or more universities," yet it is a singular fact that the establishing and support of free public schools, in Pennsylvania was postponed until the days of Thaddeus Stevens and the early life of Alexander Ramsey.

While as a matter of fact there was no defined public school system in any colony south of New England before the Revolution, nor any worthy of mention until well into the following century, yet in many places it was found in embryo.

North Carolina during the first sixty-five years of its colonial history had few schools and these were illy attended. But upon the arrival of the Scotch-Irish immigration which began in large numbers in 1736 and continued till the beginning of the Revolutionary War, there was a marked advancement in educational interest. Almost invariably as a neighborhood was settled, provision was made for preaching the Gospel. Wherever a pastor was located, in that congregation there was a classical school. These 50 were under Presbyterian auspices, both church and schools being under the charge of missionaries, graduates of Princeton. For more than half a century Princeton influence was dominant in North Carolina. The most noted school for higher education in the colony was the classical school established at Charlotte in 1767 by Rev. Joseph Alexander, a graduate of Princeton. The community in which this school was located was noted for its intelligence. The school flourished, and to meet the demand of the growing and prosperous community it was decided to enlarge its scope. By an act of the Assembly it was chartered as Queen's College in 1770. It was in fact twice chartered, and the grant was twice repealed by royal proclamation. The principles of presbyterianism and democracy were not acceptable to George III. However, his disfavor had its natural results, for Charlotte came to be termed by Cornwallis "the hornets' nest of the Revolution." Queen's College continued to thrive, and in its halls were held the significant and decisive debates ending in the adoption of the Mecklenberg Declaration of Independence of 1775.

Enough has been recited to show that the love of learning had taken deep root here and there, and was fast spreading among the colonists. Nearly a century before the Revolution, William and Mary's College had taken on new life. As early as 1660 the Virginia Assembly, moved by the growing spirit of the time, enacted that, “for the advance of learning, education of youth, supply of the ministry, and the promotion of piety, there be land taken for a college and free schools.” Subscriptions were also solicited, and they came from all classes in varying amounts. A quarter of a century later, certain wealthy planters subscribed £2,500. Royal aid and a charter were sought and obtained, with a grant of twenty thousand acres of land. The college became wealthy and prosperous. Jefferson and four other signers of the Declaration of Independence, three Randolphs, Monroe, and Chief Justice Marshall, were among its graduates.

In harmony with the spirit of the times, other colleges sprang into existence as the years went by: Yale, founded in 1701; the University of Pennsylvania in 1749; King's College, now Columbia, in 1754; Brown in 1764; Dartmouth in 1769; Queen's (Rutgers) in 1770. All these were pre-revolutionary, so that no less than 51 nine colleges were in active work prior to 1775, and no doubt hastened the belief “that all men are born free and equal,” and established the determination to stand for that belief through sacrifice and suffering.

EARLY LEGISLATION BY CONGRESS FOR EDUCATION.

It is interesting to note the change in the American idea of education, its object and scope, as modified by time and events. In the early days the purpose was to educate men for the Christian ministry. As a natural result, of the nine colleges established prior to the Revolution, all but one, the University of Pennsylvania, were sectarian in their organization and management, and this one was upon a basis which embraced all denominations. But as time went on and the love of civil liberty, local self-government, and perhaps of independence, began to grow among the colonists, it became manifest to them that

education must have a broader horizon in order to promote a growing fitness for self-government.

Men needed to become fitted for civil affairs as well as affairs ecclesiastical, for the service of the state as well as the church. So the friends of liberal education multiplied and were more aggressive. Not only the early New England statesmen, but in the more southerly localities such men as Jefferson, Madison, and Franklin, became its advocates. The eminent Dr. Benjamin Rush, one of the signers of the Declaration of Independence, voiced the spirit of the times, when in 1786 in a memorial to the Legislature of Pennsylvania, he maintained that a thorough system of popular instruction was “favorable to liberty, as freedom could only exist in the society of knowledge; that it favors just ideas of law and government; that learning in all countries promotes civilization and the pleasure of society; that it fosters agriculture, the basis of national wealth; that manufactures of all kinds owe their perfection chiefly to learning; that its beneficial influence is thus made co-extensive with the entire scope of man's being, mortal and immortal, individual and social.” And on a later occasion the same broad-minded man, addressing a member of Congress, said, “Let us establish schools in every township in the United States, and conform them to reason, humanity, and the state of society in America,” and then 52 will “the generations which are to follow us realize the precious ideas of the dignity and excellence of republican forms of government.”

One of Washington's maxims was, “Promote, as an object of primary importance, institutions for the general diffusion of knowledge. In proportion as the structure of a government gives force to public opinion, it is essential that public opinion should be enlightened.”

As one of the results of the tendencies of the times, it may be of interest to note that of the colleges established in the colonies before the Revolution, all but one were sectarian; of the four established during the Revolution, two were non-sectarian; and of the eleven established after that event and prior to the end of the century, eight were non-sectarian.

That education and sovereignty should be co-extensive is no new doctrine. It is the favorite maxim of aristrocracy the world ever, but aristocracy would have a restricted education, because it would have a restricted sovereignty. The fathers of the republic wished to clothe the people with education as well as sovereignty, and make them co-extensive by making both universal.

It will thus be seen that the American idea of education had expanded until it involved the welfare of the state as well as the welfare of the church. In fact the former would seem to be of primary importance in order to make possible the latter, securing to every man, through the state, the inestimable right to worship according to the dictates of his conscience.

Although we had at the date of our independence a liberal supply of colleges and preparatory schools, there was still a serious defect in our educational method. We were sadly lacking, except perhaps in New England, in schools for elementary instruction. The academies or grammar schools could fit advanced students for college, but we had no elementary schools to prepare them for this intermediate work. The theory of general education found no favor in the aristocratic social constitution of the mother country, and even in some of the colonies were to be found influences hostile to it. Planting the leaven of democracy among the people was followed by the natural development of its principles, especially in the direction of popular education, as essential to self-reliance and independent manhood.

53

After achieving our independence and before the adoption of the Constitution, the Continental Congress, in harmony with the growing spirit of equal privilege to all, seems to have assumed without question, that the government had the right and was vested with the power to meet the necessity of public education. So the question of the endowment of institutions of learning by the government, to aid the cause of education, met with no serious opposition in the Congress. The establishment of a common school system

was first undertaken. In the ordinance of May 20, 1785, “for ascertaining the mode of disposing of lands in the Western Territory,” this specific provision is found: “There shall be reserved the lot No. 16 of every township for the maintenance of public schools within said township.” This endowment of 640 acres of land in each township six miles square, for the support of public schools within the township was the inception of the government policy to reserve certain sections of land for school purposes. This reservation for the support of schools was definitely provided for in the organization of each new State and Territory, until that of Oregon. In the act constituting the Territory of Oregon, August 14, 1848, Senator Stephen A. Douglas, chairman of the Committee on Territories, inserted an additional grant for school purposes of the sixth section in each township, making the reservation for schools the sixteenth and thirty-sixth sections, or 1,280 acres, in each township, in all public land states and territories, thereafter organized. The grant was to be confirmed in the act of admission to the Union. Under such conditions have all public land states coming into the Union since that date been admitted. Minnesota, admitted in 1858, received her two sections in each township or about three million acres in all, for public schools, confirmed to her by the enabling act of February 26, 1857.

Congress, two years after providing by law for common schools, undertook the endowment of universities. In the act for the government of the Territory of the United States Northwest of the Ohio River, passed July 13, 1787, this provision is found:

Art. 3. Religion, morality, and knowledge being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged.

54

By the act of July 23, 1787, in the “Powers to the Board of Treasury to contract for the sale of Western Territory,” it is provided:

That not more than two complete townships be given perpetually for the purpose of an university, to be laid off by the purchaser or purchasers as near the center as may be, so

that the same shall be of good land, to be applied to the intended object by the Legislature of the State.

This inaugurated the plan of taking for the support of a state university at least two townships in each of the states containing public lands. In the legislation admitting the public land states into the Union, from the admission of Ohio in 1802, to the admission of Minnesota in 1858, grants of two townships, or 46,080 acres, for university purposes, are made. Ohio, Florida, Wisconsin and Minnesota are exceptions, each having more than two townships, the quantity granted to Minnesota being 82,640 acres. This was secured under the enabling act of Congress of February 26, 1857, and the acts of March 2, 1861, and July 8, 1870. The newer States and Territories have had or will have the benefit of this provision upon their admission into the Union.

LEGISLATION BY THE TERRITORY OF MINNESOTA FOR SCHOOLS AND A UNIVERSITY.

The Territory of Minnesota was organized under and by virtue of the act of Congress of March 3, 1849. The organic act provided for the appointment of a Governor and a Secretary, and for the election of a Legislative Assembly of two houses. It also contained a reservation of the sections of land numbered sixteen and thirty-six for school purposes. At the first session of the Assembly it enacted a school law of liberal provision for carrying out the objects of the reservation.

Governor Ramsey, in his message to the Legislature that assembled in January, 1851, called attention to the importance of establishing a university, and recommended the Legislature to memorialize Congress for a grant of 100,000 acres of land for its endowment. Acting upon this recommendation, the Legislature passed an act, approved February 19, for the establishing of a university to be styled the University of Minnesota. The act provided 55 that the proceeds of all lands that may hereafter be granted by the United States to the territory for the support of a university should be and remain

a perpetual fund, to be called the “University Fund,” the interest to be appropriated to the support of a university, and that no sectarian instruction should be allowed in such university. Its object was declared to be to provide the inhabitants of the territory with the means of acquiring a thorough knowledge of the various branches of literature, science, and the arts. Its government was vested in a board of twelve regents to be elected by the Legislature. The Regents were empowered to appoint a Secretary, a Treasurer, a Librarian, and a Chancellor, who should be ex-officio president of the Board of Regents; and to appoint the requisite number of professors and tutors. It was also provided that the university should consist of five departments: The department of science, literature and the arts; the department of law; the department of medicine; the department of the theory and practice of elementary instruction; and the department of agriculture. It was provided too that the University of Minnesota should be located at or near the Falls of St. Anthony, and that the Regents, as soon as they might deem it expedient, should procure a suitable site for the University buildings and proceed to the erection of the same as soon as funds might be provided for the purpose. They were also authorized to establish a preparatory department of the University, as soon as money could be procured for it.

This act is understood to have been the work of Hon. John W. North, chairman of the House Committee on Schools, on of the best and ablest men the state ever contained. Northfield was named for him. It was an admirable charter and believed to be far in advance of those adopted in the earlier states.

A few days later the Legislative Assembly passed a memorial to Congress, approved February 10, 1851, for a grant of 100,000 acres of land to endow a University. But other agencies had evidently been at work, for on the 19th of the same month, instead of granting the 100,000 acres, Congress passed an act similar to those of Michigan and Wisconsin, reserving from sale, out of the public lands within the Territory, a quantity of land not exceeding two townships for the use and support of a University.

The Legislature, in joint session, on March 4th of the same year, elected a Board of twelve Regents, viz: Isaac Atwater, J. W. Furber, William R. Marshall, B. B. Meeker, Socrates Nelson, Alexander Ramsey, Henry M. Rice, Henry H. Sibley, C. K. Smith, Franklin Steele, N. C. D. Taylor, and Abraham Van Vorhes.

THE REGENTS ERECT A UNIVERSITY BUILDING.

At a meeting of the Regents held in St. Anthony, May 31, 1851, the Board organized by electing Franklin Steele, president; Isaac Atwater, secretary; J. W. North, treasurer; and William R. Marshall, librarian. At this meeting the Board deemed it expedient to take steps for the immediate erection of a building for a preparatory department, and, being without funds, voted that offers of land for a site be solicited, and also that subscriptions be asked for the school's support. They began at this time the work of selecting lands granted by Congress for the support of a University.

At a meeting on June 14th following, the Regents, after viewing the several pieces of land, voted to accept that offered by Mr. Franklin Steele. The site so selected was nearly identical with the present Richard Chute square, between Second Street and University Avenue, and between Central Avenue and First Avenue Southeast.

Enough subscriptions were received to erect a frame building of 50 by 30 feet and two stories high with basement, which was completed in the fall of 1851, and a school was opened on the first of December, under the superintendence of Rev. E. W. Merrill, with an enrollment of about twenty-five students, which increased to forty during the year. The school, maintained by tuitions, existed three years in high repute, with an enrollment of about eighty-five the second year and one hundred and seventy the third year. Prof. Merrill being called to another field of work, it was then discontinued. From this time the building was used by D. S. B. Johnston and others for private schools until 1864, when it burned down. For more than a decade no further attempts were made to establish a University school.

Inquiry having been made as to the title of the ground upon which the University building had been erected, it was reported at a meeting of the Board held October 29th, 1852, that no deed for 57 the same had ever been given. It was thereupon voted that a committee of three be appointed to inquire into the propriety of a new location. At a meeting of the Board October 24th, 1854, the committee reported negotiations pending with Arnold W. Taylor and Paul R. George for a new site. This consisted of about twenty-seven acres of the present campus, the price being $6,000, payable $1,000 cash, the remainder on mortgage in six, twelve and eighteen months, with interest at 12 per cent. These terms were accepted, and the President and Secretary were authorized to make out the necessary papers. Messrs. Taylor and George, being present, executed their deed of the property to the Regents, and the notes and mortgage of the Board were given to secure the payment of the remainder of the purchase money. The $1,000 paid down was raised by subscription. Mr. Steele proposed to pay into the Treasury the amount which had been expended in the erection of the preparatory building on the site donated by himself, in lieu of donating the land, and at a later day the sum of $2,500 was realized by the Board on this matter, in the liquidation of its debts. Up to this time the University had no income except gratuitous subscriptions.

At a meeting of the Board held January 12, 1855, a building committee of three was appointed to confer with an architect and procure suitable designs for University buildings. At a subsequent meeting the committee was increased to five. On the 28th of February, 1856, the Legislature passed an act authorizing the Regents to issue bonds in the name and under the seal of the University in the sum of $15,000, bearing interest at 12 per cent, $5,000 to be applied in liquidation of the debt incurred in the purchase of the site, and $10,000 to be expended by the Regents in erecting buildings for the University, and for no other purpose. The bonds were to be secured by mortgage on any lands belonging to the University. In view of the fact that the University had no lands outside the unselected lands granted by the congressional act of 1851, except the site they had just bought for

$6,000, which was still under mortgage for the purchase money, the scheme seemed to be inspired by the spirit of thrifty frontier enterprise.

58

At a meeting of the Board held at the office of General Sibley in Mendota August 26, 1856, the building committee announced that they had advertised for proposals for the erection of University buildings, but since all bids received exceeded the sum which the committee understood the Regents were authorized to expend, they reported the whole subject back to the Board and asked to be discharged from its further consideration. The report was adopted, the committee was discharged, and a new building committee was appointed. At the same meeting Governor Ramsey offered the following resolution:

Resolved, That inasmuch as this Board has not adopted any plan for the conducting of the University, it is the opinion of this Board, the expenditure for University buildings at this time should not exceed $15,000.

Regent Fridley moved to strike out all after the word “Resolved” and insert the following:

That the building committee be instructed to accept the bid of Messrs. Alden, Cutter and Hull, and contract with them for the erection of the extension, and one wing, at the price for which they bid viz.: $49,600.

Upon this question the yeas and nays were called for, and were as follows: Yeas, Fridley, Meeker, Stevens, Atwater; nays, Ramsey, Sibley, Nelson, Black.

Mr. Steele, the president, broke the tie by giving the casting vote in the affirmative, and the resolution as amended was adopted by the same vote. With this action of the Board, carried by a bare majority against the strenuous opposition of the more conservative members, began trouble for the University which none can ever realize except those who were obliged to wrestle with it. The action was destined to cripple it in its work for a decade and a half, imperil its existence, and ultimately cost the Board $125,000. Looked at from

the standpoint of after events, the step was extremely injudicious and unwise. It is said in justification of the Regents that they figured assets and liabilities thus:

59

Assets.

Campus $25,000

Notes from sale of stumpage cut from lands granted 20,000

Due from Mr. Steele for old building 2,500

Bonds authorized by Legislature 10,000

Total $57,500

Liabilities.

Contract for building $49,600

Security for bonds 15,000

Total $64,600

Excess of liabilities $ 7,100

But this was fallacious financiering. The campus was not an available asset for any sum. The stumpage notes, even if paid, would be a sacred fund, part of the permanent endowment, only the income from which could be used.

Then the crash of 1857 came, and the bottom dropped out of everything. The stumpage notes were not paid. The campus did not increase in value as expected, and no money could be realized by further incumbering it. However, the building went on, debts rapidly

accrued, and interest began its riotous career. At a meeting of the Board January 20, 1858, Mr. Rice and Mr. Steele were appointed a committee to superintend and negotiate the issue and sale of $45,000 of bonds of the University, payable in ten years with interest at 12 per cent and not to be sold at less than par.

At this time the construction of the University building had been nearly completed, and the contractors were pressing the Regents for the money then due. In the meantime large payments had been made to them out of moneys borrowed by the Regents on temporary loans at interest of two and three per cent per month.

As a last resort, by an act of the Legislature approved March 8, 1858, the Regents were empowered to issue bonds in the name of the University, and under its corporate seal, to an amount not exceeding $40,000, with interest at 12 per cent per annum. To secure the payment of the same they were to execute a mortgage, in the name of the State, on any lands belonging to, or which might thereafter belong to, the University. This was evidently an attempt to mortgage the lands granted by Congress for a permanent endowment of the University, only the income from which might be used, 60 and was of itself, if effective, an infraction of the grant and a violation of the trust reposed in the State, both by the terms of the grant and the acceptance thereof by the State.

In a meeting at the State Capitol, February 22, 1859, the Board by resolution authorized the building committee to make settlement with the contractors, Alden, Cutter and Hull, allowing twenty per cent interest on deferred payments, also they were to give the notes of the Board payable in three, four and six months for the amount of $16,000, with interest at 12 per cent. At the close of the year 1859 the Regents found the following outstanding indebtedness against the Board:

Bonds issued under the act of Feb. 28, 1856 $15,000

Bonds issued under the act of March 8, 1858 40,000

Notes to Alden, Cutter and Hull 16,000

Total $71,000

It may be interesting to mention that the report of the Treasurer of the Board submitted December 15, 1860, states the amount of interest expense to December 1st of that year to be $33,958.64, and that the “alleged liabilities” at the same date were $81,900.61. Aside from this there was some $12,000 indebtedness for accrued interest. It is also interesting to quote from the report of the Secretary submitted at the same time, as follows:

It would be improper, after the examination of the transactions which we have made, to conclude this report without a distinct expression of our belief that there was no design on the part of the Territorial Regents to injure the cause of learning or aggrandize themselves, but that, blinded by the glare of imaginary riches, so prevalent in 1856 and '57, they supposed that the University, like themselves, could never be embarrassed for the want of money.

With this the writer heartily agrees. It would be difficult, if not impossible, now, even for those who lived through the experience, to realize the height of speculative, balloon, prosperity existing in the Territory prior to the financial crash of 1857, or the depth of financial collapse and gloom that followed it. The action of the Board was simply the fruitage of the over-zealous and oversanguine temperament of some of its members. The contractors for the building were all men of good standing living among us. Mr. Alden was an architect of high rank, Mr. Cutter a far-sighted 61 mechanic, Mr. Hull a practical stonemason; and the firm were the most prominent builders of the day. The rates of interest paid, large as they seem to us now, were simply the going rates in the market. The plan of building designed by Mr. Alden included two wings four stories high, with a main connecting part five stories high, and surmounted by an observatory, all facing to the north, nearly in the direction of the Falls and the growing town as it then was. In its day, it was a fine scheme and would have been an honor to an older state. The west

wing reaching toward the river was completed in 1858. The writer, a young law student, teaching a part of the time, often visited the building during its construction.

GREAT FINANCIAL DIFFICULTIES SURMOUNTED.

At the time of the passage of the enabling act by Congress, February 26, 1857, it was generally understood that because of the existing debts, the grant made to the Territory for the support of a university had been dissipated, lost beyond redemption. Mr. Rice, our delegate in Congress and a Regent of the University, was familiar with the situation. He was also an intimate friend of Stephen A. Douglas, chairman of the Senate Committee on Territories, and succeeded in having a clause embraced in this act, making a second reservation, granting to the State seventy-two sections of land for the use and support of a State University. This was entirely independent of the former grant to the Territory. The Constitution of the State adopted in 1857 provides as follows:

Sec. 4 (Art. VIII). The location of the University of Minnesota, as established by existing laws, is hereby confirmed, and said institution is hereby declared to be the University of the State of Minnesota. All the rights, immunities, franchises and endowments, heretofore granted or conferred, are hereby perpetuated unto the said University, and all lands which may be granted hereafter by Congress, or other donations for said University purposes, shall vest in the institution referred to in this section.

Encouraged by these provisions of the enabling act and of the Constitution, the friends of the University in 1860 undertook to reclaim the institution and save it to the people of the state. Accordingly a bill was prepared, and was enacted by the Legislature, entitled, “An act to provide for the government and regulation of 62 the University of Minnesota,” approved February 14, 1860. This was in fact a new charter for the University under the authority of the State, by the terms of which it was to be governed by a Board of Regents, consisting of the Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Chancellor, and five electors of the State appointed by the Governor and confirmed by the Senate. Under this act, in addition to

the exofficio members, the following were made Regents by appointment, viz: John M. Berry, E. O. Hamlin, Uriah Thomas, Jared Benson and William M. Kimball. The new Board met and organized April 5th, as follows: Alexander Ramsey, president; Uriah Thomas, secretary; W. M. Kimball, treasurer; E. D. Neill, chancellor.

By this and subsequent acts, the Regents of the State University succeeded to all the rights and endowments of the Territorial University. The main portion of the lands granted to the Territorial University in 1851 having been selected by the former Board, the Regents provided for the selection of the unfilled portion of the grant. They also sold some stumpage, paid current bills, and made futile efforts to liquidate the old indebtedness, but were without funds to accomplish it.

This condition of things continuing, Governor Ramsey, in his message to the Legislature of 1862, recommended that a commission be appointed with full power and authority to dispose of all the lands and property of the University in payment of its indebtedness. In pursuance of this, the Legislature passed an act approved March 8, 1862, authorizing and empowering the Regents in their discretion to arrange or compromise any existing indebtedness contracted by the former regents, and to sell and convey to the holders of any such indebtedness, upon such terms as may be agreed upon, any or all of the lands granted by Congress for the support of the State or Territorial University. But it was carefully provided in the act, that nothing contained in it should be construed as an admission of the validity of the bonds and mortgages of the former Regents, or of any notes executed by them.

In spite of the best efforts of the Regents, nothing material was accomplished under this legislation, and the reports of the officers of the board for 1861 and 1862 show simply a continuing of former conditions. In the fourth annual report of the Board, to the Legislature 63 of 1864, is found the report of Hon. Richard Chute, who had become a member of the Board and its Secretary. In this report Mr. Chute says:

The indebtedness of the institution remains the same as at the date of the last report, with the addition of accumulated interest.

Many have supposed that the endowment of two townships of land granted to the Territory of Minnesota would be lost to the State; we do not so believe. It is true that large liabilities hang over it, yet we think with prudent management an adjustment can be made of all proper demands which will leave the buildings and grounds at St. Anthony free of incumbrance, and leaving something over, with which to start the institution. Then with two townships clearly given to the State by the enabling act, a sufficient fund will in time be realized to secure the youth of our State who may desire it, a complete University education.

Continuing he says further:

The educational interests of our State demand that at an early day provision should be made for putting an University in operation, and we trust some efficient steps will be taken to secure this result.

Dear old time friend: if you had never done any thing more for the University than to speak forth these brave and inspiring words from amid the gloom of the situation, your name would be deserving of the enduring gratitude of the State.

It was at this point that friends of the University again rallied around the institution, perhaps inspired by arguments like those advanced by Mr. Chute. John S. Pillsbury had been appointed a Regent by Governor Swift in the fall of 1863, and, about the same time elected to the State Senate from the St. Anthony district, he was a member of the session of 1864. At his request the Hon. John M. Berry, also a member of the Senate, prepared a bill entitled, “An act relating to the University of Minnesota,” which passed both houses and was approved March 4, 1864. By this act O. C. Merriman, John S. Pillsbury, and John Nicols, were appointed Sole Regents for the term of two years; and the act of February

28, 1866, extended this term two years. Each was required to give a bond with sureties, in the sum of $25,000, for the faithful performance of duty. They were clothed with authority to adjust and pay all claims and demands of whatever nature against the University or Regents, and for that purpose to sell and convey any lands not 64 exceeding 12,000 acres donated to the Territory for University purposes. This amount was increased to 14,000 acres by act of February 28, 1866. The act of 1864 also required the former Regents to turn over to the Regents thereby appointed,

all books, records, papers, claims, notes, bonds, stocks, and personal property of every description belonging to said University or the Regents thereof, and the care of all lands belonging to said University or the Regents thereof, and the care of all lands belonging to the University and the University buildings and grounds, and the collecting of all claims due the University.

The precautionary clause of the act was that nothing contained in it should be construed as an admission of the validity of any claims. Because of the doubtful value of the mortgage, the bonds had been selling in the market as low as fifteen and twenty cents on the dollar.

Clothed with complete authority, this triumvirate undertook the herculean task of freeing the University of its embarrassments, and such was the devotion applied to the task through the years 1864, '65 and '66, that they were enabled to report to the legislative session of 1867 the payment and discharge of every obligation against the University (except about $6,000) with the proceeds of 11,110 acres of land, leaving intact the campus, and buildings and some 32,000 acres of land of the Territorial grant.

The people of Minnesota can never sufficiently recognize or compensate the services of these three men of the state, nor acknowledge the toil they endured and the sacrifice they made in the accomplishment of this great work, but they will receive, as is most justly due them, the love and gratitude of the friends of education in this state, through all coming

time. By their zeal and effective labors, instead of a total loss, as seemed probable, the prophecy of Mr. Chute was fulfilled and there was saved to the University, after paying all the debts, two-thirds of the original Territorial endowment, to which was added the endowment of two townships granted by the enabling act and confirmed to the State by act of Congress of July 8, 1870.

In the meantime, nothing worthy of mention had been done for the support of a school, and the building had been going to decay. But the University was again on its feet financially and the Legislature of 1867, at the request of the Regents, made an appropriation 65 of $15,000 to cover repairs and the employment of teachers commencing the grammar and normal department. With this fund the building was repaired, and October 7, 1867, the preparatory department was opened with W. W. Washburn, B. A., as principal and instructor in Greek; Gabriel Campbell, B. A., instructor in Latin and grammar; and Ira Moore, Ph. B., instructor in mathematics. About seventy students were enrolled during the year, both girls and boys.

ADDITIONAL LAND GRANTS BY CONGRESS.

We now arrive at another epoch marking a period in the life of the University. July 2, 1862, Congress enlarged the national educational endowment system. Every state was to have a donation of 30,000 acres of public land for each senator and representative to which such state would be entitled under the apportionment of 1860. This endowment was for the support of colleges for the cultivation of agricultural and mechanical science and art. Under this act Minnesota became entitled to 120,000 acres, but, through some technicalities in the selection realized only about 96,000 acres.

The friends of the University were anxious to consolidate this grant with the University endowment, as the original charter of the University had provided for an Agricultural Department, and the union of the endowments would give a strong support to both. The Regents in their report of 1867 had recommended the consolidation. A bill modeled largely

upon the charter of Michigan University was therefore prepared by Morris Lamprey, Esq., at the suggestion and by the aid of Senator Pillsbury. The bill was enacted by the Legislature and approved February 18, 1868. By this act the University was entirely reorganized. It provided for five or more colleges or departments, specifically naming a department of elementary instruction; a college of science, literature and the arts; a college of agriculture and the mechanic arts, including military tactics; a college or department of law; and a college or department of medicine. It placed the government of the University in a board of nine Regents, of whom the Governor and the Superintendent of Public Instruction should be ex-officio members, and seven remaining members were to be appointed by the Governor and confirmed 66 by the Senate. The act conferred on the new Board the rights, franchises, and endowments of the former Board, and, in addition, all the interest and income of the Agricultural College grant, and such gifts, grants and contributions to the endowments as might be derived from any sources.

The Board realized about 94,000 acres from the agricultural grant. By this act, in 1868, it was made a duty of the Board to secure suitable lands for an experimental farm and to improve and maintain the same for experimental purposes in connection with the course in the Agricultural College.

By an act of March 1, 1872, the Legislature provided for a Geological and Natural History Survey of the State and placed the same under the control of the University, appropriating $1,000 annually for expenses. The following year, in order to carry out such survey, the Legislature, by an amendatory act of March 10, 1873, increased the money appropriation to $2,000 annually, and transferred to the Board of Regents certain “salt spring lands,” so-called, which had been donated by the General Government to aid in the development of the brines in the State. These lands were to be sold by the Board and the proceeds held in trust and applied in carrying out such survey. Under this Salt Springs Grant and its transfer to them, the Regents realized some 34,114 acres of land, the proceeds of which were to be applied as stated above.

An act of Congress, approved March 2, 1887, granted $15,000 annually from the sale of public lands, for the support of an experiment station in each state in connection with the agricultural college. Another Congressional act of August 30, 1890, supplements the income from the permanent Agricultural College fund, with an additional grant of $15,000 to each state, and with an increase of $1,000 a year till it reaches a maximum of $25,000. This also is only payable out of the proceeds of public land sales, and of course is contingent upon there being such a fund from which it can be paid. These several grants complete the land endowment of the University.

THE BOARD OF REGENTS UNDER THE CHARTER OF 1868.

Under the new charter of 1868, the Board was constituted as follows, the three Regents previously existing being made members of the new Board: William R. Marshall, governor (ex-officio); Hon. Mark H. Dunnell, superintendent of public instruction (ex-officio); General H. H. Sibley, St. Paul; Prof. E. J. Thompson, Rushford; Hon. O. C. Merriman, St. Anthony; Hon. John Nicols, St. Paul; Hon. John S. Pillsbury, St. Anthony; Col. R. S. Donaldson, Farmington; and Hon. A. A. Harwood, Owatonna.

Mr. Pillsbury was made president; Mr. Nicols, secretary; and Mr. Merriman, treasurer. The Board was increased to ten in 1872, and to twelve in 1889.

With the reorganization act of 1868, the protracted struggle to save the corporate existence of the institution and its properties was brought to a successful close, and the real life and history of the University began. As has been seen, a school had been opened with three professors in the fall of 1867. It was successfully conducted, and in 1868 the roll of instructors was increased to five and the attendance was 109.

PRESIDENCY OF WILLIAM W. FOLWELL.

Before the beginning of the school year of 1869–70, William W. Folwell was called to the presidency of the University. Dr. Folwell graduated from Hobart College in 1857; was a brilliant student and served for a time as assistant professor of mathematics in his Alma Mater, after which he studied and traveled abroad. The stirring events of 1861 found him in the Fiftieth New York Regiment of Engineers, with the rank of First Lieutenant. He served through the war in the Army of the Potomac, being promoted to the rank of lieutenant colonel. After the war he was professor of mathematics in Kenyon College, from which position he was called to the presidency of the University, at the age of thirty-six. By a peculiar coincidence, Colonel Folwell and the writer met on a railroad train, as he was coming to the state to begin his work here. This was the commencement of an exceedingly pleasant acquaintance, which, I am happy to say, has continued ever since unbroken.

It was a serious problem that confronted the Regents, to select a man who in scholarship and executive ability would be able to erect a University out of chaos, and to successfully launch it in a 68 new and untried sea. But after careful search they had chosen their man and shifted the responsibility to him. Colonel Folwell had not only a fine equipment in education, but an experience beyond his years in serious affairs. Having faith in the future, he assumed the task with an evident design of making it his life work.

The preparatory school, opened in September, 1867, under the principalship of Prof. Washburn, had brought a small company of young men and women to a point where they could be provisionally ranked as freshmen. Most of them, however, had no hope of completing a college course. The first college work in the University was begun September 15, 1869. The faculty for the year was composed of W. W. Folwell, president, and eight professors.

Then followed fifteen years of steady and inconspicuous work on the part of the faculty, laboring together to build up the college and carrying cheerfully the heavy load of preparatory teaching necessary under the circumstances. It was, in fact, founding upon a rock an intellectual and moral building, laying deep and broad the basic things on which

the superstructure of the future institution could safely rest. How well their work was done has been fully attested by the experience of the years following. The preparatory school, conducted by the University professors, was so successful in its work and management that it was adopted as a model for the high schools of the state—then unsystematized and immature. There was, of course, no thought of any other ultimate work than the development of the academic departments.

In anticipation of the future growth and the addition of professional schools, the Regents adopted a general plan of organization, formulated by Dr. Folwell. By this plan, it was intended to merge the elementary instruction of all the departments which might later be created into one so-called “Collegiate” Department, which should carry the students up to the end of the sophomore year. From this point they would separate to the respective colleges from which they desired graduation. The plan was truly scientific, but it was novel in our country and met with opposition. The Regents, however, in 1872 after a full consideration, decided to continue this method, and did continue it in its formal shape for many years. Upon a change in the executive it was allowed to lapse. The University of Chicago, upon its reorganization, adopted a similar 69 plan and has found it a successful basis of work for students of the first and second years, and in “Junior Colleges.” The plan made but slight innovations in the kind and range of studies. It affected the adjustment of departments, it reorganized secondary education and implied its ultimate relegation to the “Secondary Schools.” One object of this method seems to have been to bring the University into complete articulation with the general school system of the state, so that, as soon as practicable, the first two years of ordinary college work could be left to the high schools, and students of the University could begin work in the various colleges there with the usual junior year. This would have enabled the University, ultimately, to devote more of its time and strength to higher University work and original research.

Of the little band of freshmen setting out in 1869, but two reached the end of the four years' course, and were graduated in June, 1873. These were Henry Martyn Williamson, son of Thomas A. Williamson, the early and well-known missionary to the Dakotas; and

Warren Clark Eustis, a member of a well-known St. Anthony family. Both are still living. The first commencement was celebrated with becoming ceremonies, at which many of the dignitaries of the state were present. It was in fact a more notable event to the University than any similar one in its further history.

During this period there were two colleges in the University, aside from the preparatory department, viz., the Academic, and the College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts. The enrollment of students was variable, changing from 230 in 1869–70 to 308 in 1879–80 and 310 in 1884–85, those in the preparatory classes gradually growing less, while the college students were generally on the increase. The English course of the preparatory school was discontinued in 1871, and the others through the following years, until at the end of the decade but one sub-freshman class remained. This was finally dropped in 1891. In 1871 the faculty had increased to double its original number.

70

EXPERIMENTAL FARM OF THE AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE.

In 1869 the Regents, in pursuance of the plan of reorganization, secured a tract of 120 acres of land near the University for experimental work in agriculture. The cost of this tract was $8,500, and work was commenced under the supervision of suitable instructors, and was maintained continuously. But the quantity of land was deemed inadequate and the quality not suited for the best work. The growth of the city finally began to encroach upon the locality. The Regents, therefore, in view of these conditions, decided it was best to make a change. To that end in 1881 they procured the passage of an act by the Legislature, authorizing them, at their discretion, to make sale and conveyance of the experimental farm, and to reinvest the proceeds in other lands suitable in character and location. They were also permitted to survey and plat the old farm, if it was deemed best.

In December following, the Regents referred the matter to their executive committee, which in the month of June, 1882, reported a plan for the platting and sale of the

experimental farm, and for the purchase of the Bass farm so-called. This land, 155 acres near Lake Como, had been examined by the professor of Agriculture and the Regents. They found it satisfactory, and had agreed provisionally to purchase it at $200 an acre, the amount to be paid as soon as funds could be realized from the sale of the experimental farm. The action of the executive committee was approved and they were authorized to buy the land. The plat was thereupon executed by the officers of the Board and recorded. They first had a careful appraisal of the lots made and a minimum price fixed, sufficient to bring at least $50,000. Then they proceeded to sell at public auction, and realized the remarkable sum of over $150,000.

The fortunate outcome of this venture enabled the Regents to pay at once for the Bass farm, and also to purchase from Mr. N. P. Langford an additional tract of 94 acres adjoining. This was bought for $300 an acre. With the remaining funds the Regents began to improve the lands and erect a farm house, a barn, and sheds. A plant house was built for the Horticultural Department. A school building with heating apparatus and laboratory was constructed; a water plant was installed by sinking wells and erecting wind mills and water tanks. All that seemed to them then necessary 71 for a well equipped experimental farm was done. This land, to the great advantage of the students, was only about two miles from the University, and it adjoins now the grounds and plant of the State Agricultural Society.

By act of March 8, 1878, the Legislature provided for the purchase of 116 acres of land at Lake Minnetonka, known as the Gideon fruit farm, for experimental work in fruit culture. They placed the same under the supervision of the Regents, appropriating $2,000 for payment and $1,000 for support. ‘After ten years' experience the Legislature, upon the advice of the Regents, authorized the sale of the property and the use of the proceeds in experimental work on the farm bought in 1881, which was accordingly done.

RESIGNATION OF PRESIDENT FOLWELL.

We now come to a new epoch in the history of the University Dr. Folwell's fourteen years of quiet, persistent, and constant work had been eminently successful, but had also proven a severe strain upon him physically. In view of this, and as a solemn duty he owed to himself and his family, he resolved to free himself from the burden of the executive work of the institution. Therefore, in February, 1883, he sent to Gen. H. H. Sibley, president of the Board, his resignation as president of the University from the end of the current year. The resignation came before the Board at its next meeting, March 8, 1883, and was accepted provisionally, to take effect when a successor could be elected. At the same meeting it was considered and decided, in view of the need the University felt of his services, to tender to Dr. Folwell the chair of Political Science, and he was accordingly unanimously elected. Dr. Folwell kindly consented to act as president until his successor should be chosen. In 1884 he accepted the position tendered by the Regents, the chair of Political Science, which he has ever since continued to fill with eminent satisfaction to all concerned.

I cannot pass from the presidency of Mr. Folwell without a few words of approval and just praise for the work done by him in the dull and arduous years of his administration. At the beginning the task was especially difficult. A plan had to be created and work done according to a meager equipment, but always with the thought of possible future growth. The scheme of organization had to be 72 wrought out in a school that as yet knew no regular lines of work. The instructors were required to be general utility men, ready for any employment that might come to them. But order and system was the result. Primary work was gradually dropped, and collegiate work advanced. A close relationship with the high schools of the state was established, and a consistent foundation was laid for future college and University work. The result is an educational system, combining the common school, the high school, college and University, that is the power and glory of the state. We cannot place too much honor upon those who have contributed to this noble work.

PRESIDENCY OF CYRUS NORTHROP.

Upon the resignation of Dr. Folwell the Board appointed a committee consisting of its president, Governor J. S. Pillsbury, and Judge Greenleaf Clark, to visit the different colleges of the country with the view of finding a suitable man for the presidency. So great was the interest that in practice this committee was enlarged and embraced every member of the Board. The search, far and wide, was finally narrowed to the professor of English Literature in Yale University. Some members of the committee had visited the professor, seeking information, but not distinctly stating their purpose, and reported their conclusions. Another and larger representation of the Board paid him a subsequent visit, and after eliciting all the information possible, surprised the professor by offering him the position. The proffer was not received with much enthusiasm. After two hours of persuasion, with the use of every glowing picture for the future, within the capability of Northwesterners, all he would grant to us was a reluctant consent to come out and look over the University, the people and the country. Well, he came, he saw, and he was evidently conquered, for Cyrus Northrop, LL. D., became the new president of the University, commencing his work with the beginning of the college year of 1884–5.

The remaining story of the University must rest in its minutiae with the historian of the future. It is not yet enough in perspective to be historically told. We can only enumerate the facts of its wonderful development. It is too much a part of our active life and intense interest, to measure what these facts mean for the years to come.

President Northrop came to an institution with an enrollment of 310 students, nearly half of whom were in secondary school work. In 1890 the number had risen to 1,002; in 1895 to 2,171; in 1900 to 3,236; and in 1905 to 3,790. The degrees conferred during this period correspond with the enrollment. In 1885 there were 19; in 1890 there were 120; in 1895 there were 296; in 1900 there were 404; and in 1905 there were 547. Of these graduates some three thousand reside in the State.* The total attendance and degrees conferred year by year will appear in tabular form in the appendix.

* Compare the published address of Prof. David L. Kiehle, “History of Education in Minnesota,” given at the Annual Meeting of this Society, January 19, 1903, (Minn. Hist. Soc. Collections, Vol. X, 1905, pages 353–398), and his book of the same title, in two parts (pages 120 and 101), published in the late part of 1903, by the H. W. Wilson Co., Minneapolis. A table on page 396, Volume X cited, shows the enrollment and graduations in the several departments of the University of Minnesota from 1868 to 1902.

This phenomenal growth is, with very few exceptions, unprecedented in the history of educational institutions in this country or any other. During this period the following colleges have been created: Medicine in 1884; Law in 1888; Mining in 1891; Pharmacy in 1892; Dentistry in 1893; and Chemistry in 1904. A separate department for graduate work is now being considered. The faculty and teaching force of the University now engaged in its work numbers about 230. The Libraries now contain about 100,000 bound volumes, and one-fourth as many pamphlets, magazines, and reports. The Museums, general and technical, compare favorably with those usually found in similar institutions.

THE UNIVERSITY BUILDINGS.

With an appropriation of $50,000 by the Legislature in 1873, a main building was constructed, attached to the old wing, not according to the original design, but facing to the east instead of north. About the same time an agricultural building was erected on the campus. This was burned in 1888. In 1875 the sum of $25,000 was appropriated for finishing and furnishing the University buildings. Through appropriations by the Legislature of $18,000 in 1877, $20,000 in 1879, and $20,000 in 1881, the campus was enlarged and improved in form and accessibility to streets, and it now consists of about fifty acres of land.

The Legislature of 1881 appropriated $180,000, made available in six equal annual installments, for new buildings to be erected upon a plan devised by President Folwell,

who wanted $300,000. This appropriation was not accomplished without much hard work by the friends of the University; but when the Legislature came to understand the situation, they gladly voted the sum required, and a brighter day dawned for the institution. The burning of the State Capitol and two state institutions soon after this appropriation. made an unusual demand upon the Treasury, so that the funds could not be realized until two or three years later.

Subsequent appropriations by the Legislature, for buildings. equipment, and support, on the campus and at the agricultural farm, amount, including the foregoing, to the sum of $1,846,000 for buildings, $2,703,600 for support, and $553,200 miscellaneous. as will appear fully in detail in the appendix to this article.

The permanent University fund arising from the sale of lands granted is $1,400,000, the income from which for the year 1904–5 was $54,100. 36,310 acres of the lands still remain unsold.

The main building of the University and the old wing were burned in September, 1904. The Legislature at its last session appropriated $450,000 towards the construction of a new main building and it is in process of erection. The University buildings now clustered upon the campus and at the experimental farm, with their cost values, are as follows:

ON THE CAMPUS.

Erected. Cost Value. Mechanic Arts Building, $30,000 and $10,000 1886 $40,000 Pillsbury Hall and Equipment 1889 145,000 Law Building, $30,000 and $28,000 1889 58,000 Boiler House 1890 20,000 Chemical Laboratory 1891 90,000 Main Medical Building 1893 56,000 Laboratory, Medical Chemistry 1893 10,000 Library and Assembly Hall 1895 156,000 Ore Testing Works 1895 7,500 Observatory 1896 2,266 Laboratory, Medical Science 1896 40,000 The Armory 1896 75,000 The Clinical Building 1899 15,000 Electrical Building 1900 20,000 75 Engineering Shops 1900 32,000 Anatomical Building 1900 15,000 Physics Building 1901 55,600 The Barn 1901 1,200 School of Mines Building 1903 61,000 $899,566

ON THE EXPERIMENTAL FARM. Cost

Erected. Cost Value. Farm House 1884 $ 15,000 Farm Barn 1884 15,000 School of Agriculture (frame) 1888 18,000 School of Agriculture (brick) 1890 30,000 Chemical Laboratory (frame) 1891 8,000 Dairy Building 1892–6 30,000 Dining Hall and Dormitory 1896 42,500 Drill Hall 1896 37,500 Girls' Dormitory 1898–02 37,000 Heating and Lighting Plant 1898–00 28,000 Plant House 1899 4,600 Horticultural Hall and Physical Laboratory, including Equipment 1900 35,000 Veterinary and Live Stock Building 1902 25,000 Agricultural Chemistry Building 1902 25,000 Blacksmith Shop 1902 6,000 Meat House 1902 7,500 Swine Breeding Building 1902 3,000 Live Stock Pavilion 1902 29,000 Machinery Building 1902 5,000 $401,100

DONATIONS TO THE UNIVERSITY.

The first donation, other than those on subscription lists, was made to the University in 1872 by friends who contributed $720 to purchase Ward's casts of fossils for the Museum.

In 1884 the University was in great need of a building for the natural sciences, which according to estimate would cost about $150,000. The funds appropriated by the Legislature were insufficient for this and other buildings imperatively needed. Hon. John S. Pillsbury came to the rescue at this time with the most generous offer to erect the building himself and present it to the state, providing the Legislature would put itself on record as “forever in 76 favor of the integrity of the University” through making the Agricultural College one of its departments. This most gracious offer was accepted by the Regents with profound gratitude. The building was erected at a cost of $131,000 and paid for by Mr. Pillsbury. It was first called “Science Hall,” but by the action of the Regents the name was changed to “Pillsbury Hall,” by which it will ever be known.

In 1885, $12,000 was raised by subscription through the state for the erection of a Students' Christian Association building on the campus. The building was presented to the Regents at its dedication in 1887.

In 1892, the citizens of Minneapolis gave $5,000 for the erection of Ore Testing and Milling laboratories in connection with the School of Mines and Metallurgy. The same year the City Council did work amounting to $7,000, in sidewalks and curbing on the campus, which they presented to the University.

In the year 1893, the Regents desired to procure by purchase from Samuel H. Chute, Esq., fractional Block 1 of the Mill Company's Addition at the corner of University Avenue and Eleventh Avenue S. E., in order to bring the campus out to the street line, whereupon Mr. Chute generously tendered them a free gift of this tract, which greatly added to the beauty and symmetry of the campus. Its reasonable value was about $1,500.

In 1901, the Hon. John D. Ludden, of St. Paul, gave a trust of $5,000 to the Board of Regents, the income to be used for the assistance of students of either sex in the School of Agriculture.

The same year a trust of $50,000 known as “the Gilfillan Trust” was established. The interest from this sum was to be used for “youths of our state struggling for an education beyond their means of attaining.”

In 1902, Mr. Caleb D. Door, of Minneapolis, erected a beautiful drinking fountain on the campus, at a cost of several thousand dollars. The same year Mrs. E. C. Gale expressed to the Regents her wish to enclose the University Avenue side of the Campus, by building a stone and iron fence, which should be a memorial to her father, Gov. John S. Pillsbury. This was done at an expense of $8,000. The beautiful gateway and artistic construction are a great addition to the grounds.

In 1904, the heirs of Governor Pillsbury carried out his intention of giving to the University six lots, thus enlarging Northrop Field to a suitable size for military drill and physical training. This gift was valued at $15,000.

In 1904, the Hon. John D. John D. Ludden increased his gift $5,000, thus making a trust of $10,000, the interest from this amount to be used as he had previously requested.

In 1904, Mr. Alfred F. Pillsbury had that part of the campus known as Northrop Field enclosed by a substantial brick wall, making the athletic grounds of the University among the best in the country. This was done at a cost of $15,000.

The Alumni created a fellowship of $250 a year, in 1887, which they have maintained since by subscriptions. The class of 1889 contributed a fund of $500. The income from this yields an annual prize in history, known as “The '89 Memorial Prize.”

The Gillette Herzog Manufacturing Company have offered since 1891 two prizes a year, $50 and $30, to the College of Engineering, Metallurgy and Mechanic Arts, which is now being continued by Messrs. L. S. and G. M. Gillette.

The Prof. Moses Marston Scholarship in English, which is the interest on $1,000, was established in 1892.

The Albert Howard Scholarship was established in 1893. The amount, $4,500, was invested in government bonds, yielding $160 a year, and is at the discretion of the Executive Committee, who recommend its recipient to the Faculty.

In 1895 a college fellowship of $200 annually was announced in the College of Engineering, Metallurgy and Mechanic Arts.

Hon. J. T. Wyman since 1900 has contributed an annual prize of $25 for an essay on an economic subject in the department of Political Science.

A fund of $5,000, yielding a scholarship of $250 a year, was given in 1901 by Mrs. Mary H. Elliott, to be used as a “scholarship loan fund for assisting young men in the School of

Mines." This was done as a memorial to her husband, Dr. A. F. Elliott, in fulfillment of his wish.

In 1904, Mrs. Martha S. Cutts gave $500, known as the Rollin E. Cutts fund, to maintain a prize in the College of Medicine and Surgery.

78

The will of Mrs. A. F. Elliott left a bequest to the University from which the Regents expect to realize $125,000. The heirs have requested that this fund be used to erect a hospital in connection with the Medical Department. The decision relating to this use of the bequest is held in abeyance, at the suggestion of Governor Johnson, until it is known what action the Legislature will take relative to the support of the hospital.

The primary gift of the present year is that of Mr. Thomas H. Shevlin. He donates $60,000 for the erection of a woman's building on the campus. This building is to be known as the Alice Shevlin Hall.

Through the history of the University there have been many gifts of much value to the Library and Museum. The Hon. Frederick Weyerhacuser met for five years the expense of a professor of Semitie Languages, hoping that in this way a permanent chair might be established for this work.

Thus we arrive at the very interesting summary that $460,995 has been given in donations to the University in the last thirty three years.

Of this, $46,500 was to improve the campus; $323,000 was for buildings; $720 was for museums; $60,000 was in trust funds to help students; $11,500 was in trust funds for scholarships; $3,560 is interest on these scholarships; and $7,215 is the cumulated amount from annual scholarships.

This is more than one-fourth of the entire amount appropriated by the Legislature for buildings, both at the Agricultural College and on the campus, during the same time; which speaks well indeed for the comparative interests of the individual and the state in education in Minnesota.

SERVICE FOR THE UNIVERSITY BY JOHN S. PILLSBURY.

The most devoted friend and generous giver the University has had was John S. Pillsbury, who from 1863 to the close of his life was tireless in his efforts to promote its interests. One potent cause of its great prosperity has been his skill and watchfulness in the management of its financial affairs. In recognition of the long and invaluable service of Mr. Pillsbury, in the interest of the University, the Legislature in 1895 made him Regent for life, an honor 79 without precedent in the history of the state. His decease in 1901 was an irreparable loss to the University and to the community in which he lived so long.

This, then, is the story, imperfectly told, of the University of Minnesota, the work it has done, and the equipment it has for the work it is now undertaking to do. What is claimed for it, is, that it is doing good, substantial work in whatever it undertakes, work equal to that done in any similar institution in the country, especially in scientific lines.

THE AGRICULTURAL DEPARTMENT.

The Agricultural Department, with its school of agriculture, experiment station, and sub-stations at Crookston and Grand Rappids, is probably superior to that of any other state. The school, opened in 1888 and maintained ever since, had an enrollment for the year 1902–3 of 638 students, 513 of whom were men, and 125 women, and in the year 1903–4 an enrollment of 705, 562 men and 143 women. The curriculum includes practical work in dairying, farming, stock breeding, horticulture, chemical analysis of soils, soil products, etc. All this work is of a high order and most practical kind.

THE GEOLOGICAL AND NATURAL HISTORY SURVEY.

The Geological and Natural History Survey of the state, inaugurated in 1872, has from that date to the present time cost about $278,000, which, excepting a few small sums appropriated by the state in the early years, has been paid from the proceeds of sales of salt lands, which have now become exhausted. This survey has proven of immense value both to the University and the state. Its reports, sent to every part of the world, have been published in twenty-four annual reports and seven final quarto volumes of the Geological Survey and eight volumes of the Botanical and Zoological Surveys. The explorations and reports of the geological work have been the means of opening up one of the richest and most extensive mineral regions in the world, some portion of which has been saved to the State before being entirely lost by sale to private parties. These mines have already yielded a revenue to the state of $900,000.

CAUSES OF THE GROWTH OF THE UNIVERSITY.

The past of the University is full of encouragement, and its future bright with promise. It was located by its organic act “at or near the Falls of St. Anthony,” and this location is confirmed by the constitution of the state. It occupies a place in the city of Minneapolis, beautiful for situation, upon a broad plateau on the high east bank of the Mississippi river, which sweeps in curving lines at its feet far below. The grounds, about fifty acres in extent, command a fine view of the falls, and a long vista of the river and gorge below, as well as of the city and region round about. But the institution is sufficiently remote from the business center, not to be disturbed by the buzz of machinery or the hum of traffic.

Its marvelous growth may be traced to several causes, among which are the rapid increase of the state in population and material wealth; the magnificent support it has received from the government, both state and national; the like generous aid given to the common schools and high schools of the state, and the development of them as part of an

educational system equal if not superior to that of any other state; the sectarian and the other preparatory schools of a more private character; and the superior facilities afforded in the two cities for employment of students dependent more or less upon their own efforts in gaining an education. These are some of the conditions contributing to swell the column marching toward the University. But above all this and more than all this, has been the rare wisdom and skill of its President, Dr. Cyrus Northrop, possessing, as has been so truly written of him, the unusual “combination of statesman, scholar, man of affairs, and leader of men.” whereby this mass of applicants to the University has been received, arranged systematically in classes, and carried successfully through to graduation, free from clamor without or friction within.

One most fortunate circumstance in the life of the institution has been that only once in all the years of its active work has there been a change in the presidency. Then the incoming policy was in utmost harmony with the work which had preceded, each supplementing the other to the profound advantage of the University. Its 81 administration stands a consistent unit, from its beginning until now, never working away from its original tenets, but developing and adding to them. Dr. Folwell deserves, as he most justly receives, the meed of all praise for his foundation work; and Dr. Northrop merits every encomium for the matchless manner in which he has met and controlled this unexpected and marvelous expansion, and builded it, upon the old foundations, into the splendid institution of learning which is the pride of the state today.

It was the fortune of the writer to come to the Territory in 1855, and he has been an interested spectator of the growth and development of the state and its educational institutions; he was elected to the State Senate in 1875, and for ten years, as a friend of the University, and as chairman of the joint committee of the Legislature, had to do with whatever legislation affected the institution; in 1881 he became a regent, and for eight years was active as one of the executive committee, in the management of its affairs.

At the end of this time a protracted residence abroad made him feel the expediency of declining a re-appointment.

HOPES AND QUESTIONS FOR THE FUTURE.

It is unnecessary for me to say that I have an unbridled ambition for our State University and its future, and the greatest hope in what it shall be able to do for the people. Minnesota, with its rich natural resources of field, forest, and mine, and with a fast growing, enterprising and aggressive population of varied origin, needs just such an educational system as we have, to mould and assimilate the different nationalities into one complete and homogeneous people, fit material for the upbuilding of a great state. In this work the University must have the culminating share.

When we look back to the years 1785 and 1787, we must indeed admire the prescience of the men, who in those now famous ordinances laid the foundation of commonwealths by providing for education in this vast empire. The ordinance of 1787, styled by Webster the Magna Charta of the Northwest, was the handiwork of a man born and bred in an atmosphere of learning, Nathan Dane. of Massachusetts.

During the last half century, and especially since the practical results of the grant of 1862 have begun to be seen, the great value of that beneficent ordinance has come to be more fully realized. Minnesota is one of the states that has been most highly favored in carrying out the provisions of the ordinance, and this places upon us a corresponding obligation. We as a people must so care for this trust that we can render to ourselves and our community an acceptable account of our stewardship. The state has made a good beginning. To use Huxley's figure, she now “has an educational ladder reaching from every home, however humble, within her borders, up through the common schools and high schools, ending at the University.” Every boy and girl who will, may climb. We must see to it that they find an institution at the top which yields them not only

greater information, but nobler standards, giving to them, besides knowledge, wisdom in knowledge. To that end we must save it free, as it has thus far been, from the virus of political intrigue, supplement its already generous support with whatever else it may need, and make it all we would have it to be. It should be not only the center of learning, but the radius of culture for the commonwealth, standing to those who belong within its colleges as the “open sesame” to the best that life may know,—not an institution doing some good to great numbers, but the greatest good to each one who names it Alma Mater.

In our aspiration to accomplish this, it would be the part of wisdom to pause occasionally and determine whether we are pursuing altogether the best course, either for the individual or the state. Are we trying to carry too large a percentage of our youths up through the higher grades of learning? Might it not be better, both for the individual and the commonwealth, to scrutinize more carefully the masses seeking entrance to our higher schools and the University, and, by the formula of admittance, to select those for advanced courses of study who are by ability and temperament qualified and susceptible for them, diverting to careful study in the trades and more manual callings those who by taste and ingenuity are best suited to succeed in these lines? The problem is one for the best thinkers and statesmen to solve, the ultimate point to be gained being the development of a people composed of the two elements, 83 the artistic artisan and the scholarly student. This seems to have been the spirit inspiring the land grant of 1862, in aid of agriculture and the mechanic arts. The question is, does our system of education give to every one taking advantage of it “that love of learning which is better than learning itself?” Has instruction improved our education? Facts massed do not represent knowledge. Assimilation is the mental process of growth, as well as the physical. “Education is the unfolding of the whole human nature, the growing up, in all things, to our highest possibility.” Its trinity is the cultivation of the mind, the morals, and the manners.

It will require time to reach the best solution of these things, but experience is a great teacher and will lead to the truth in due course. In all the states in the Union, striving, through their institutions of learning, to elevate their sons and daughters to a higher

manhood and a truer culture, may our own beloved commonwealth and her great University ever be found, as now, among the foremost and the best.

84

APPENDIX. Statistics of the University of Minnesota.

Year. Annual Expenditures out of Appropriations for Buildings. Support. Miscellaneous Appropriations. Attendance by Years. Degrees Conferred. 1867 $ 8,000.00 $ 500.00 1868 7,000.00 72 1869 $ 11,508.20 146 1870 22,500.00 212 1871 10,000.00 17,500.00 225 1872 21,000.00 265 1873 15,000.00 16,500.00 278 2 1874 61,500.00 30,000.00 2,500.00 287 2 1875 7,850.00 30,000.00 237 9 1876 18,500.00 36,135.00 1,000.00 267 12 1877 39,000.00 18,000.00 304 16 1878 4,500.00 43,700.00 371 16 1879 45,980.00 28,000.00 386 26 1880 2,000.00 31,500.00 308 18 1881 47,000.00 20,000.00 271 28 1882 1,000.00 43,881.41 253 34 1883 46,091.67 223 25 1884 39,000.00 59,706.83 278 26 1885 15,720.00 72,140.08 310 19 1886 28,000.00 71,357.71 406 22 1887 36,000.00 84,100.17 412 30 1888 40,000.00 54,990.59 491 38 1889 35,930.00 85,740.18 5,650.00 781 52 1890 160,353.30 185,406.25 1,002 120 1891 73,488.03 166,781.10 11,000.00 1,183 129 1892 43,787.45 184,624.15 9,500.00 1,374 162 1893 44,096.89 202,586.13 9,500.00 1,620 250 1894 114,330.10 223,687.45 4,500.00 1,828 247 1895 111,950.07 254,117.98 37,000.00 2,171 296 1896 140,224.26 244,101.97 9,500.00 2,467 346 1897 68,626.75 283,716.26 24,000.00 2,647 320 1898 73,995.45 288,375.50 49,500.00 2,890 324 1899 335,742.89 34,500.00 2,925 335 1900 74,833.99 374,075.39 23,500.00 3,236 404 1901 42,294.35 398,850.47 61,600.00 3,413 421 1902 172,661.38 415,104.71 35,450.00 3,656 458 1903 114,104.20 420,745.16 63,000.00 3,788 434 1904 115,040.34 438,589.43 27,500.00 3,845 473 1905 166,213.44 455,596.33 77,500.00 3,790 547 $1,846,000.00 $5,781,933.01 $553,200.00

NOTE.—The footings for “Support” include amount appropriated by the Legislature $2,703,600.00

Also appropriations by the General Government, including interest on Permanent Fund, as well as Receipts from the University,—students' fees, sales, etc., amounting to 3,078,333.01

Total as above, $5,781,933.01

The author desires to acknowledge the very valuable assistance of Mr. D. W. Sprague, Accountant for the University, in the preparation of the foregoing table.